

TOWN OF GREENFIELD
Planning Board

September 28, 2021

REGULAR MEETING

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by Tonya Yasenchak, Chair, at 7:00 p.m. On roll call the following members are present: Butch Duffney, Charlie Dake, Mike Gyarmathy, Robert Roeckle, Joe Sabanos, Nick Querques, and Tonya Yasenchak. Karla Conway are absent. Charlie Baker Town Engineer is present. M. Waldron, Zoning Administrator/Code Enforcement Officer is present.

Minutes

To be reviewed at the next meeting.

Woodland's Edge/Grassi, J. Case #647
 TM# 151.-2-57

369 Grange Road
 Major Subdivision

No one is present for this project. T. Yasenchak states the Board won't be able to review this project they just received the Town Engineers letter this afternoon.

Pileckas, P. Case #647
 TM# 1643-1-32.14

32 Mill Road
 Minor Subdivision

Paul Pileckas is present. T. Yasenchak states that the Board received a letter from M. Waldron. M. Waldron reads the letter for determination of keyhole lots for the record. P. Pileckas states that the deed starts at the center of the road and there is more frontage due to this. C. Baker states that he only has the map dated April 26, 2021 and asks if there is a newer map. T. Yasenchak states yes, dated August 18, 2021. C. Baker states that he does not have a copy of that one. C. Baker states that he asked for a grading plan and he does not see that. P. Pileckas states that the existing line that is there he is not grading there. R. Roeckle states that B. Baker is looking for the grading for the septic system and if there is additional clearing for them. Where is the well on the adjacent parcel? P. Pileckas asks if he needs to put the existing well and show the grading that is flat on the map. R. Roeckle states correct. B. Duffney states once P. Pileckas gets the frontage straightened out and everything that C. Baker is looking for on the map he will be fine with it. M. Gyarmathy states also locate the existing well. R. Roeckle states where it is located. T. Yasenchak states that she agrees that the Board needs the grading plan and well. C. Baker states he will require a Basic SWPPP if the Board approves

this Minor Subdivision. M. Waldron asks where for the adjacent lot wells locations and a Basic SWPPP. T. Yasenchak states that this project needs to be referred to Saratoga County Planning Department and possibly take action on October 26, 2021.

Provost, C. Case #656
TM# 138.-1-40.2

Grange Road
Lot Line Adjustment

Cecil Provost is present. T. Yasenchak states the Board just received this tonight because it was submitted on October 8, 2021 and with the Holiday the Board has not had an opportunity to review this before now. Last time he was in front of the Board C. Provost had changed the lots now he is back to 4 lots. C. Provost states that he is not nixing it. It is a 4 acres land locked parcel. Both lots are fully conforming and that are required. T. Yasenchak asks what lot 1B is. C. Provost states that is the land locked parcel. N. Querques asks if by making property bigger he is hoping that the Board will approve this. C. Provost states correct. R. Roeckle states the larger lot does not show a home. C. Provost states he is keeping it for himself. T. Yasenchak states that there is no existing plan to compare to. C. Provost states that lots 2, 3, and 4 have not changed. G. Gyarmathy that's not the Board's problem. If the Board approves this it would creating additional lots. C. Provost states no he isn't. N. Querques states that to him it looks like C. Provost has 4 lots (that the Board approved last year) and now it is 5 lots. T. Yasenchak agrees. C. Provost states that Town Counsel was at the last meeting he was tonight he could possibly help the Board with this. M. Gyarmathy states that he is not opposed to it, but he is not arguing about it either. B. Duffney feels this was a Minor Subdivision and now it is a Major Subdivision. M. Waldron states that the applicant was told by the Board and by himself that if he came back within 5 years it would be a Major Subdivision. C. Provost states what he is proposing is a Lot Line Adjustment not a subdivision. T. Yasenchak states that they will ask the secretary to review the conditions that were modified on August 28, 2021. B. Duffney states he would like to see the wetlands delineation where the house and septic are going. T. Yasenchak agrees and wants to see the topography for the whole lot. M. Gyarmathy states that he is glad to hear the land locked parcel getting absorbed. C. Dake and K. Conway agree. C. Baker states the Board would need to see the typical notes, no further subdivision in the future, and what was done the last final approval on the map. T. Yasenchak sets a public hearing for October 12, 2021 with what C. Baker has requested and provides the original signed subdivision. C. Provost asks if the staff will provide or would you prefer him to provide. T. Yasenchak states however he prefers.

Gyarmathy, M. Case #659
TM# 124.-1-23

16 Plank Road
Minor Subdivision

Mike Gyarmathy recuses himself. Mike Gyarmathy and Stephanie Farradino are present. T. Yasenchak states that this was an approved subdivision and the Board did not realize that it needed to go to Saratoga County Planning Department for a referral. It has been sent to the County and the Planning Board now has the referral from them. S. Farradino states this subdivision was done 49 years ago. On September 15, 2021, M. Waldron called in a favor with Mike Valentine (Saratoga County Planning Department Senior Planner) and asked if this project could be in front of their review on September 16, 2021. Last time this project was in front of the Planning Board the map only showed lots A, B, C, and D it didn't show the mobile home park. R. Roeckle states that the Board reviewed this in June and did not think that they

need to review it. B. Duffney asks if the Board received the County referral. T. Yasenchak states yes, and it states that there is no significant Countywide or intercommunity impact. 2 lots remain undeveloped.

MOTION: B. Duffney
SECOND: C. Dake

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board completes Part II of the Short Form SEQRA. All questions are answered "no" and the second box is checked, indicating that this will not result in any significant negative environmental impact for the Minor Subdivision of Michael Gyarmathy for property located at 16 Plank Road, TM# 124.-1-23.

R. Roeckle states that the County referral should be attached as verification.

VOTE: Ayes: Conway, Dake, Duffney, Roeckle, Yasenchak, Querques
Noes: None
Abstain: Gyarmathy
Absent: None

MOTION: N. Querques
SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants approval for a Minor Subdivision for Michael Gyarmathy for property located at 16 Plank Road, TM# 124.-1-23.

VOTE: Ayes: Conway, Dake, Duffney, Roeckle, Yasenchak, Querques
Noes: None
Abstain: Gyarmath
Absent: None

Grosso, C. & K. Case #664
TM# 152.-1-70.12

251 Locust Grove Road
SUP

Christopher and Kristen Grosso are present. C. Grosso states that this property is 76 acre parcel. They are looking to put a covered riding arena for their current 7 horses. There are not any wetlands on the 40 acres pasture. They have 60 acres of wooded trails. They worked with M. Waldron on this and he helped them prepare all the plans and application. M. Waldron states that this project is a Site Plan Review. T. Yasenchak agrees and states that it gets a little confusing the way the Code is written and she reads the definition. The riding arena is an accessory building. M. Waldron states that he handed out what he had at the last meeting. K. McMahon states there was only 1 map provided. T. Yasenchak states that the Board can pass it around. T. Yasenchak asks if they are doing anything to the barns and where the manure is located. C. Grosso states that is located on the map and is far away from the well. R. Roeckle asks what is the maximum number of horses that they own. C. Grosso states 6 stalls barn. K. Grosso states they own 9 horses some are always being farmed out and they can stay outside. B. Duffney states that he did do work there for C. Grosso 15 years ago and has not seen him since. He has an issue with the Code with 70+ acres parcel. The animals are not being neglected. T. Yasenchak agrees with B. Duffney. K. Conway states that she does not have an issue with this and wishes them well. C. Dake states if the applicant decides to change anything then they would have to come back in front of the Board. T. Yasenchak states that the

only thing that is in our Code is if someone has a 5 stall barn it is a large stable and under 5 stalls is a small stable. K. Conway asks how many horses they are planning on having. K. Grosso states that they do not have any plans for any more. M. Gyarmathy states he wishes them the best. C. Baker states this is a beautiful property and this is what Greenfield is all about. B. Duffney states that the previous owner had 40 horses on this property.

MOTION: B. Duffney
SECOND: M. Gyarmathy

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the public hearing for Christopher and Kristen Grosso, for property located at 251 Locust Grove Road, TM# 152.-1-70.12.

VOTE: Ayes: Conway, Dake, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Roeckle, Yasenchak, And Querques
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

C. Baker states they need to see the separation of the manure and the well and how far their personal well is from the manure on the map. T. Yasenchak asks C. Baker if that could be a condition or would he prefer to see it first. C. Baker states that he is fine with it being a condition.

MOTION: K. Conway
SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants approval for a Site Plan Review for Christopher and Kristen Grosso, for property located at 251 Locust Grove Road, TM# 152.-1-70.12, contingent upon:

- Showing where the manure is to the well for the animals and for their personal well on a map.

VOTE: Ayes: Conway, Dake, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Roeckle, Yasenchak, Querques
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None

Kasselmann Solar, LLC Case#665
TM# 125.-2-70

97 Brigham Road
SUP/SPR

Alex Martin is present. A. Martin states this is a 10 kW ground mount solar array for a residence. It is 200' back in the southeast of the property and it will be next to the existing ground mount solar. The array will be closed off visually from the neighbors. They will be using helicopter screws to mount it. The decommissioning is easy. T. Yasenchak asks if the older array will be staying. A. Martin states yes, he believes that it is not a Kasselmann Solar array. M. Gyarmathy states it has been there for years. T. Yasenchak states that if it is being abandoned and the Board needs to know that from the homeowner. What color are the brackets going to be? A. Martin states gray or black not galvanized. T. Yasenchak states are the max height 12'. A. Martin states 12.9'. T. Yasenchak states the Board will need a spec sheet. They have not received it and they have received it from his company in the past. M.

Gyarmathy states the house sits back off the road and the older array is back further than the proposed array. He asks what is the percentage of the electricity currently he believes it is 37%. A. Martin states that he is not sure. Does the electricity go back to the residence? A. Martin states that starting in 2022 there will be a tariff. R. Roeckle asks if there will be any battery storage on the site. A. Martin states no there are no plans for it. N. Querques asks if the panels will be owned by the property owner. A. Martin states yes. B. Duffney asks if the power will be put back into the grid. A. Martin states only if it is over property usage, then it will go back to the grid. B. Duffney asks how close to the keyhole lot next door. A. Martin states 171' back to the southwest property line and 305' from the back of the property. N. Querques asks if they are silicone panels. A. Martin states that he believes so. T. Yasenchak states that would be on the spec sheet. T. Yasenchak sets a public hearing for October 12, 2021. The Board requests the color of the supports, confirm the height is 12.9', the glare spec sheet, and the percentage of electricity.

Whipple, T. Case #666
TM# 123.-3-9

KROD/SPR
365 Plank Road

Thomas Whipple is present. T. Whipple states he is in front of the Board for KROD Overlay District. This lot cannot be seen from anywhere it is in a valley. The septic and well will be within the setbacks. T. Yasenchak states this project is Site Plan Review. There are wetlands on this project, but the proposed home is away from them. Windows can only be 40% of the square footage of the house. What color is the proposed house? T. Whipple states blue. T. Yasenchak states the exterior lights must be facing downward. T. Whipple states yes. T. Yasenchak asks what kind of roof. T. Whipple states asphalt shingles. T. Yasenchak asks if there will be any other structures. T. Whipple states no. B. Duffney states that this parcel is set down in the dip of valley. T. Whipple states that driveway is more towards the hill because of the site distance. B. Duffney states it is not like it is on the top of the hill. T. Whipple states he is clearing 1,500 square feet and he will be putting up a split rail fence. B. Duffney states that he is fine with this project as long as all the engineering questions are answered. T. Yasenchak states that the driveway needs to be where the subdivision was approved. T. Whipple states that shows where the driveway permit is on the map. T. Yasenchak states T. Whipple will have to get with staff and find out where it was approved. T. Whipple asks if he will be required to get an "as Built" survey. T. Yasenchak states not for the Planning Board, but you may be required for the Building Department. K. Conway asks where is the septic system she does not see it. T. Whipple asks K. Conway if she has it. K. Conway asks shouldn't it be labeled. M. Gyarmathy states yes, it should be. T. Whipple states he submitted it on the smaller map. M. Gyarmathy states it is not noted. T. Yasenchak states they have talked about the lighting, color, the windows not being over 40% of the square footage, the drainage plan is accurate, the buffer should be 25' from the property line, and the applicant does have that. The home should not be height should not be more than 35'. It appears it meets the original map that was approved. C. Baker states this is similar to the one the Board reviewed recently and they looked at the detailed drainage and grading plan, a culvert will be required. The Board will need to see a hydrologic detailed drainage plan for the calculation for the culvert connection to the road for erosion control. T. Whipple asks from a surveyor or an engineer. C. Baker states that depends on if your surveyor is qualified to do it. The Board will need to see the erosion control plan because of the proximity of the wetlands to the road. N. Querques states that the Board required one for the last case. R. Roeckle states we need additional information. T. Yasenchak states that the Board can set a public hearing for October 12, 2021. T. Whipple requests to have the public hearing on October 26, 2021. The Board agrees.

Keyzer, J. Case #667
TM# 137.-1-16.1

907 North Creek Road
Minor Subdivision

John Keyzer is present. M. Gyarmathy recuses himself. T. Yasenchak states that J. Keyzer has been in front of the Board for a Minor Subdivision in the past however it has been 5 years. J. Keyzer states that it has been over 5 years. They are looking to do a 4 lot subdivision. He states 3 of the lots to the northeast and 1 lot to the south. All of the lots are 3 acre lots. He states that they did not have the site distance done yet they have them from the previous proposed subdivision that was under review a couple years ago. T. Yasenchak states that the Board will need to see driveway locations with site distance for all 4 lots. The Board would like the lots labeled differently to minimize the confusion (it looks like the subdivision looks like an eight lot Major Subdivision. Also the Board will need to see where the proposed septic systems and homes will be on the lots. J. Keyzer states that eventually it is going to be a road there. T. Yasenchak states the driveway on there could be construed as segmentation. J. Keyzer states that he did that in the past. T. Yasenchak the Board would look at it now as a Major Subdivision. The Board will also need to see limits of clearing. R. Roeckle states he believes this property is in the flood plain. That needs to be verified. B. Duffney states that the site distance needs to be provided. How long are the driveways? If they are longer than 500' then they will need emergency vehicle turnarounds. J. Keyzer states that he understands that and there is no problem for the fire trucks to turn around. T. Yasenchak states that the map needs the typical driveway notes. She states the location of lot 7 is going to need a turnaround. It appears to be 521'. B. Duffney states that the width of the turnarounds needs to be 12' drivable and 50' in length and a turning area for fire trucks. C. Dake asks if there is anything going to be beyond the number of lots. J. Keyzer state no. K. Conway states the Board does not generally approve keyhole lots. N. Querques agrees and states he has concerns about keyhole lots and feels it needs to be maximized. J. Keyzer states they are legal. N. Querques states the Board does not have to approve them. C. Baker states to piggyback on N. Querques statement the Board approved J. Keyzer's keyhole because of site distance lots in past lot 7 does not have to be a keyhole lot. He states that the Board will need clearing limits for all the lots, a note (on the map) referencing to future subdivisions including lots 12-16, verification of lot 8 possibly being in the flood plain because he believes it of the Kaydeross Creek. He is also concerned with future remaining property. He feels J. Keyzer is piece-mealing his property and feels that there should not be any other subdivision approvals. J. Keyzer states that he can't say that there will not be any further development of land in the future. C. Baker states that may be a condition of approval. T. Yasenchak states J. Keyzer has homework to do moving forward.

DISCUSSION

T. Yasenchak states the Board received a letter from Aaren Harris, Little Wings Farm School at the last meeting. M. Waldron asks what the Board's response to the letter is. T. Yasenchak asks M. Waldron if A. Harris needs to be in front of the Board for a Site Plan Review and to check to see if it is Code compliant. M. Waldron states that she was working with CLA Sites on an educational facility at her property. After her first time in front of the Planning Board she had a follow up conversation with him. In the letter it states that he required her to get licensed by NYS however that is not true. He did not require it. M. Gyarmathy states the Board does not have purview over this. R. Roeckle states no, not over educational. M. Gyarmathy

states if she uses an ert she will be required to get a Building Permit. T. Yasenchak states she referenced the Waldorf School in her letter and she did come in front of the Board. C. Baker states he is not sure if it is a Site Plan Review. He had a conversation with her engineer and he feels it could be a problem. M. Gyarmathy states that an ert is a temporary structure. M. Waldron states she could use her house, but if her school grows it could be a problem. M. Gyarmathy states she could keep growing. M. Waldron states that is what he is concerned with. R. Roeckle states if it is in her personal home then it won't concern the Board. T. Yasenchak states from reading her letter she doesn't want to be licensed when it grows doesn't she have to be. M. Waldron is concerned with the open Planning Board case/application. Should she withdraw the application? T. Yasenchak states that the Board can ask for clarification. She should respond within a certain amount of time. R. Roeckle states if it is not regulated by NYS is that in this Board purview. T. Yasenchak asks K. McMahon to draft a letter and email it to herself and R. Roeckle. B. Duffney states they have been going through this for years and they are held to standards with time sensitive projects. T. Yasenchak agrees and states projects fizzle out and moving forward it should be put in our Code. The Code has not changed in 10 years. B. Duffney states that they need to narrow projects down, if they have not been in front of the Board in 4 months then the Application should be closed. T. Yasenchak states that they can reach out to Town Counsel and ask for help with this process so projects can go faster. Perhaps put conditions on approvals. M. Gyarmathy states that the Board needs to be careful because NYS Building Codes change yearly. T. Yasenchak states we will work on this it does need to be in the Code. M. Gyarmathy states maybe a form letter. T. Yasenchak states that she is working on new forms to help track the process of projects. K. McMahon states that she has 2 file draws full of inactive files. They are not closed just haven't done anything with them in years. T. Yasenchak asks if K. McMahon can make a list for the Board. K. McMahon agrees to do so.

Meeting adjourned at 9:43 p.m. All members in favor

Respectfully submitted by,

Kimberley McMahon
Planning Board Administrative Assistant